Case 1:16-cv-08759-KPF Document 46 Filed 03/17/17 Page 1 of 13

H38WfasC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 JOE FASANO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, 4 5 Plaintiffs, 16 Civ. 8759 (KPF) 6 V. 7 GUOQING LI, et al., 8 Telephone Conference 9 Defendants. 10 New York, N.Y. March 8, 2017 11 11:15 a.m. 12 Before: 13 HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, 14 District Judge 15 16 **APPEARANCES** 17 SADIS & GOLDBERG LLP Attorneys for Plaintiffs 18 BY: SAMUEL J. LIEBERMAN (via speakerphone) 19 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP Attorneys for Served Defendants 20 BY: ABBY F. RUDZIN 21 22 23 24 25

H38WiasC

(In the robing room)

THE COURT: Mr. Lieberman, this is at least in part principally a motion to decide lead plaintiff and lead plaintiffs' counsel, and you may recall from our last conference, which was on defense counsel's forum non conveniens motion, that what we wanted to do was to figure out who would be plaintiffs' counsel and who therefore would be responding to the served defendants' motion.

Why are you not here?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Your Honor, I completely misunderstood, in the absence of an opposition or response on the motion, and I apologize profusely for misunderstanding the schedule. I can be there in person within the half hour, and Mr. Lopez indicated that appearing by telephone was possible. It was my misunderstanding, and I apologize for the inconvenience to the Court at this time. I'm very sorry about this.

THE COURT: Sir, just to be clear, yes, you can as a theoretical matter be here at some point later today, but Ms. Rudzin has been waiting patiently and not being able to do work for other cases on which she might bill, because you are not here. And secondly, yes, Mr. Lopez said that this could be done by phone, but that's only because you did not have the courtesy of showing up. It does not bode well for your application for lead plaintiffs' counsel that you would have

taken the initiative not to come today.

_

Was there something in either of my scheduling orders that suggested you did not have to appear?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Your Honor, I misunderstood. This is my misunderstanding, and I apologize as well to Ms. Rudzin.

This is my mistake. This is wrong, and I misunderstood the sequencing, and I'm happy to do whatever it takes to address these issues because I misunderstood the schedule. This is not about anything that you have done here, so I apologize for the misunderstanding, and it was my misunderstanding.

THE COURT: Let me understand this, sir. Is it correct, then, at this time that it is only Mr. Fasano and the two Altimeo entities who have put in, as it were, to be lead plaintiff in this case?

MR. LIEBERMAN: That's right. No one has opposed. No one else has put in. That's right.

THE COURT: May I understand, please, the relationship, if any, between Mr. Fasano and either of the Altimeo entities, because I thought I had two here, am I correct, Altimeo Asset Management and Altimeo Optimum Fund?

MR. LIEBERMAN: That's right. Mr. Fasano has no relationship as far as I'm aware, other than both having been ADS holders of the E-Commerce China Dangdang company.

THE COURT: I understand that. They have all decided to serve as colead plaintiffs or at least it would be Fasano

H38WfasC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Asset Management; Altimeo's other entity, the Optimum Fund, is not offering to be lead plaintiff, sir?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Your Honor, Optimum Fund is. Optimum Fund is a holder and Asset Management is the manager of the Optimum Fund, so with respect to certain rights, the Asset Management arm has the power to act, but it is the fund itself that was the holder.

THE COURT: Let me ask a different question, sir. Who precisely is seeking to serve as colead plaintiff with Mr. Fasano?

MR. LIEBERMAN: All three are seeking, so the Optimum Fund and Altimeo Asset Management.

THE COURT: OK. You'll excuse me if this sounds imprecise, but why do I need three colead plaintiffs, especially since right now I've got nobody else who is interested? It just seems to me that I would only need one, but tell me why I need three.

MR. LIEBERMAN: It is the Court's discretion. I think the reason that we ask that the three be permitted is that from those who have approached us, these are the parties that have shown interest in serving as leadership for this action. Mr. Fasano is someone who is interested. Both of them have indicated that they'd like to participate, and given that, from our perspective as counsel, having been approached by both, we don't discourage any of them from applying.

I'm going to be asked to give some extra something to individuals or entities who, or that, have served as lead plaintiff, and I'm just concerned about that. Certainly if Mr. Fasano does extra work than other class members, he may be entitled to a class representative award, but I'm just trying to ensure that Mr. Fasano and the Altimeo entities aren't seeking to serve as colead plaintiffs simply to engender unnecessary expenses in the conduct of this litigation.

Can you give me some assurance that that will not happen?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes, your Honor. No. 1, that is not their goal. Their goal is more to have say in the operation of the litigation; we haven't given consideration to seeking an award. I know you mention it's possible they could ask for one. What I can tell you, and you can put this in the record, is that we will not be seeking duplicative awards, should there be any award, and I really haven't had an opportunity to speak with the clients about it, whether they would at all, but such award would be sought apportioning it out as if it was one request for an award. We'll do everything we can to avoid any duplication or requests based on duplication.

THE COURT: Here's my second question, sir. If you're serving as lead plaintiffs' counsel, and that's a big "if" given your nonappearance this morning, you would have to be

IIJOWLASC

reaching out to each of Mr. Fasano and the Altimeo entities, so doesn't that necessarily increase, even on an incremental level, the amount of work and coordination that you'll have to do?

MR. LIEBERMAN: I can't foreclose the possibility that it would be an incremental amount. However, in terms of setting up conference calls, I have been able to manage the amount of time as if there is only one party thus far because I'm able to give updates and set up meetings where both can attend.

THE COURT: All right. I will be mindful, as will you, of the fact that I don't want there to be unnecessary litigation expenses, attorney's fees or otherwise, simply because three purchasers of the securities in question wish to participate.

All right, sir. I have read your papers. What else do you want me to know?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Other than the papers and satisfying that, you have the submission of the parties' interests in the litigation based on their holdings. You also have my firm's biography and our experience prosecuting similar matters, so we would rest on the papers. Again, I just wanted to reiterate my apologies for misunderstanding the schedule and apologize for the inconvenience to the Court, and if coming down and showing up later in the day can in any way be helpful, I'm happy to do

that.

THE COURT: That will not be necessary. I have other matters on the calendar, and I don't want those to be interrupted.

All right, then. Inasmuch as I have no other entity hoping to serve as lead plaintiffs' counsel and I only have these three purchasers who are seeking to serve as colead plaintiffs, I will be granting the motion. I have considered the PSLRA provisions regarding the presumptions of the most adequate plaintiff and the standards that are set forth there in Section 78u-4. The three requirements here are satisfied: They have filed a complaint in the matter; they have the largest financial interest of any class member, and we'll see at some later date whether they satisfy the prerequisites of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, but I don't think that's an issue that I need to resolve right now.

Certainly typicality and adequacy of representation are the only things that I really need to look at at this time, and I can. Indeed, looking at cases like Foley v. Transocean Ltd., a Southern District decision from 2011, I really only need a preliminary showing of typicality and adequacy.

Mr. Fasano and the Altimeo entities have made this showing and I will allow it, and I will at this time, based on the written submission, more than today's endeavors, appoint Sadis & Goldberg as counsel.

Mr. Lieberman, you've got to show up next time. Don't apologize again, because that's not going to help you. Just show up or understand that if it appears that your firm and your clients are not that interested in pursuing this case, there are things that I can do to reflect that in my docket as well.

Now that I have the parties here and I've forced

Ms. Rudzin to be here all of this time, there is something else

I'd like to understand. Mr. Lieberman, there was a schedule

set at our last conference regarding the forum non conveniens

motion. I am assuming that that is a schedule that your firm

can meet. Am I correct?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Separately, and I appreciate that I am keeping Ms. Rudzin here, I do not understand, or at least I have concerns that Ms. Lu has been adequately served. There is some strangeness about the affidavit of her service. It looks almost like she resisted efforts to serve her. There's a rider that I'm not entirely sure of that seems to list everybody else.

Could you tell me, please, are you believing, sir, that Ms. Lu was adequately served in this case?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, we went to the office of the firm, and I will go back to the discussions from the last conference. We went to the office where she serves as

director, which is the Yum China Holdings Inc. office of plaintiffs, and she is a director there. This is the primary place of business, and we provided the summons to someone there, and the person accepted it and then mailed it back.

We're reporting on that effort here. We believe that that is notice, and we are concerned about a dodging of service, why somebody would be advertising themselves publicly, and she's actually on the board of this company. And in the last conference, it was counsel for the other entities who said there are states that allow you to serve at the office where you serve as a director. We believe that this does give notice. We are also still following up in China, but we provided this affidavit as well.

THE COURT: All right. Is that a long way of saying you believe she has been properly served?

MR. LIEBERMAN: We believe this will satisfy it, yes.

THE COURT: All right. We'll see.

Ms. Rudzin, just to be clear, you would not be representing Ms. Lu, or she has not asked you to represent her at this time?

MS. RUDZIN: Right. I've never even spoken with her.

THE COURT: If she asked you, would you be representing her, or are there conflicts with the folks that you do represent that would prevent you from doing that?

MS. RUDZIN: I don't see a conflict right now, but I

haven't been asked to represent her, so I haven't thought about it that much.

Your Honor, just because Mr. Lieberman did speak about me and what I said at the last conference about how some states have laws that say you can serve directors of a company by serving the company's registered agent, my understanding, and I have no idea if Texas has such a law, but the laws I do know, for example, the law in Delaware only allows that when the suit arises out of the defendant's service as a director of that company that's being served.

THE COURT: That was my understanding as well.

MS. RUDZIN: I don't know if Mr. Lieberman is hanging his hat on that kind of statute in Texas, which would seem to be facially inapplicable, or if he's trying to say that somehow Ms. Lu actually physically works there, which I don't believe is correct, so I'm not sure why he thinks serving a company that has an outside director constitutes service on the outside director, particularly when he's already alleged that she lives in another country.

THE COURT: That's where we are. OK.

Mr. Lieberman, in our prior conference you had discussed the possibility of making an application for substituted service. I don't know what has happened since the 14th of February, or thereabouts, the middle of February when we last met, but is it your contemplation, sir, that in

opposing what is now a scheduled forum non conveniens motion, when you file your opposition, would you be adding to that an application for substituted service or alternate service?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Your Honor, the answer to that is that it depends on the status of ongoing efforts to serve in China. We did get an update on where that stood. We have been informed by the International Legal Cooperation Center that the documents have been delivered to a court in China to begin processing service internally. If those efforts are proceeding and we have service effectuated, and we got a prediction of something in the neighborhood of a month from February 24, which is when we last got an update on service. We made service in mid-January through the Hague process. We got an update on February 24, and we're monitoring that. The vagaries of service in China are such that I can't give a full guarantee, I really have to monitor it on an ongoing basis. What we've been doing is monitoring and calling to stay on top of the service process there.

If we are able to effectuate service promptly, by the end of March, then we may not have a ground for seeking substitute service. On the other hand, if as is frequently the case service efforts get bogged down and the effort is not completed by April 28, it's agreed we would expect to use the leave for filing extra pages to seek substitute service. I'm hoping we won't have to.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LIEBERMAN: But it's possible we still may.

THE COURT: All right. I can hope as well. That's almost two months from now, so perhaps there will be more progress on that front, but I did want to ask because we had talked about it previously.

Ms. Rudzin, is there anything else you'd like to bring to my attention while we're here?

MS. RUDZIN: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Lieberman, anything else, sir?

MR. LIEBERMAN: No. That's it. We will update the Court if we get confirmation of service before that because your Honor had mentioned last time that as a matter of prudence you'd want to wait and see what would happen, so should we get service or confirmation of service before that, we will update the Court accordingly.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. Two things,

Mr. Lieberman. No. 1, could you please arrange to obtain a

transcript of this conference in the ordinary course, and if

you order it I will receive a copy electronically; you don't

have to send it to me.

And thing 2, if you have a form of order for appointment of lead plaintiffs' counsel and lead plaintiffs, you may email it to the chambers' email inbox -- you don't have to file it on ECF -- copying Ms. Rudzin, and we will look at

H38WfasC

that. Otherwise we'll do it ourselves, but some folks have these lined up and I'll at least look at the ones that they've done.

MR. LIEBERMAN: We'll get that in to the Court today.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Lieberman, anything else, sir?

MR. LIEBERMAN: That is all, your Honor. Thank you for your understanding.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you both very much.

(Adjourned)